

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS
Raymond Ballister Jr., Esq., SBN 111282
Russell Handy, Esq., SBN 195058
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900
Zachary Best, Esq., SBN 166035
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92111
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax
amandas@potterhandy.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Brian Whitaker,

Plaintiff,

v.

**Lucky Charm RK Investments,
LLC**, A California Limited Liability
Company;

Defendant,

Case No.

**Complaint for Damages and
Injunctive Relief for Violations
Of: Americans With Disabilities
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Brian Whitaker complains of Lucky Charm RK Investments, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; ("Defendant"), and alleges as follows:

PARTIES:

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is substantially limited in his ability to walk. He suffers from a C-4 spinal cord injury. He is a quadriplegic. He uses a manual wheelchair for mobility.

2. Defendant of Lucky Charm RK Investments, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company owns and operates the Best Western Roseville Inn located

1 at 220 Harding Boulevard, Roseville, California currently and at all times
2 relevant to this complaint.

3 3. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business
4 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their
5 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,
6 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.
7 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, is
8 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary
9 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when
10 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of other
11 Defendants are ascertained.

12 **JURISDICTION:**

13 4. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28
14 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with
15 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

16 5. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause
17 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of
18 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights
19 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

20 6. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is
21 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is
22 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

23
24 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

25 7. This is a lawsuit challenging the reservation policies and practices of a
26 place of lodging. Plaintiff does not know if any physical or architectural
27 barriers exist at the hotel and, therefore, is not claiming that that the hotel has
28 violated any construction-related accessibility standard. Instead, this is about

1 the lack of information provided on the hotel's reservation website that would
2 permit plaintiff to determine if there are rooms that would work for him.

3 8. After decades of research and findings, Congress found that there was
4 a "serious and pervasive social problem" in America: the "discriminatory
5 effects" of communication barriers to persons with disability. The data was
6 clear and embarrassing. Persons with disabilities were unable to "fully
7 participate in all aspects of society," occupying "an inferior status in our
8 society," often for no other reason than businesses, including hotels and
9 motels, failed to provide information to disabled travelers. Thus, Congress
10 decided "to invoke the sweep of congressional authority" and issue a "national
11 mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with
12 disabilities," and to finally ensure that persons with disabilities have "equality
13 of opportunity, full participation, independent living" and self-sufficiency.

14 9. As part of that effort, Congress passed detailed and comprehensive
15 regulations about the design of hotels and motels. But, as importantly,
16 Congress recognized that the physical accessibility of a hotel or motel means
17 little if the 61 million adults living in America with disabilities are unable to
18 determine which hotels/motels are accessible and to reserve them. Thus,
19 there is a legal mandate to provide a certain level of information to disabled
20 travelers.

21 10. But despite the rules and regulations regarding reservation procedures,
22 a 2019 industry article noted that: "the hospitality sector has largely
23 overlooked the importance of promoting accessible features to travelers."

24 11. These issues are of paramount important. Persons with severe
25 disabilities have modified their own residences to accommodate their unique
26 needs and to ameliorate their physical limitations. But persons with disabilities
27 are never more vulnerable than when leaving their own residences and having
28 to travel and stay at unknown places of lodging. They must be able to ascertain

1 whether those places work for them.

2
3
4 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

5 12. Plaintiff planned on making a trip in March of 2021 to the Roseville,
6 California, area.

7 13. He chose the Best Western Roseville Inn located at 220 Harding
8 Boulevard, Roseville, California because this hotel was at a desirable price and
9 location.

10 14. Due to Plaintiff's condition, he is unable to, or seriously challenged in
11 his ability to, stand, ambulate, reach objects, transfer from his chair to other
12 equipment, and maneuver around fixed objects.

13 15. Thus, Plaintiff needs an accessible guestroom and he needs to be given
14 information about accessible features in hotel rooms so that he can confidently
15 book those rooms and travel independently and safely.

16 16. Plaintiff went to the Best Western Roseville Inn reservation website at
17 [https://www.bestwestern.com/en_US/book/hotels-in-roseville/best-](https://www.bestwestern.com/en_US/book/hotels-in-roseville/best-western-roseville-inn/propertyCode.05230.html)
18 [western-roseville-inn/propertyCode.05230.html](https://www.bestwestern.com/en_US/book/hotels-in-roseville/best-western-roseville-inn/propertyCode.05230.html) seeking to book an
19 accessible room at the location on March 1, 2021.

20 17. This website reservation system is owned and operated by the
21 Defendants and permits guests to book rooms at Best Western Roseville Inn.

22 18. Plaintiff found that there was insufficient information about the
23 accessible features in the "accessible rooms" at the Hotel to permit him to
24 assess independently whether a given hotel room would work for him.

25 19. Here, the hotel reservation website fails to describe or provide details
26 about the accessibility features in the guestrooms or any details such as
27 accessible bathtub, shower, toilet, grab bars, lavatory sink.

28 20. With respect to the shower, the Hotel reservation website does not

1 provide any information on existence of accessible roll-in shower/accessible
2 bathtub/shower seat. The plaintiff mightily struggles while transferring from
3 wheelchair to shower/ bathtub. The grab bars in the shower/ bathtub are an
4 essential requirement as it helps him in assistance and transfer accordingly.
5 Under the “Accessible – 1 King”, room available the hotel reservation website
6 simply states, “Bathtub”. The information provided is insufficient and lacks
7 description. The Plaintiff needs to know the accessibility of the Bathtub. Thus,
8 making it more difficult for the Plaintiff to individually assess the room prior
9 booking. Stating if a particular room is a roll-in shower or tub is a threshold
10 issue for most persons with mobility disabilities like Plaintiff.

11 21. As for the toilet, there are no details about the height of the toilet and
12 the grab bars. Plaintiff cannot transfer from his wheelchair to a toilet unless
13 there are grab bars at the toilet to facilitate that transfer. The plaintiff struggles
14 mightily with toilets which are either too tall or too low, as he has to transfer
15 from his wheelchair to the toilet. He needs to know the height of the toilet. But
16 the Hotel reservation website does not provide any information about the
17 existence of grab bars for the accessible guestroom toilets.

18 22. As for the lavatory sink, Plaintiff has had tremendous difficulty with
19 using lavatory sinks in the past because sinks were cabinet style sinks or had
20 low hanging aprons that did not provide knee clearance for a wheelchair user
21 to pull up and under or, alternatively, where the plumbing underneath the sink
22 was not wrapped with insulation to protect against burning contact to his
23 knees. Here, the Hotel reservation website provides no information about the
24 accessibility of the sinks in the accessible guestroom.

25 23. Plaintiff does not need an exhaustive list of accessibility features.
26 Plaintiff does not need an accessibility survey to determine if a room works for
27 him. Plaintiff, like the vast majority of wheelchair users, simply needs a
28 handful of features to be identified and described with a modest level of detail:

- 1 • For the doors, Plaintiff simply needs to know if he can get into the hotel
2 room and into the bathroom. This is a problem that has created
3 tremendous problems for the Plaintiff in the past. A simple statement
4 that the hotel room entrance and interior doors provide at least 32
5 inches of clearance is enough to provide Plaintiff this critical piece of
6 information about whether he can fit his wheelchair into the hotel
7 rooms.
- 8 • For the beds themselves, the only thing Plaintiff needs to know (and the
9 only thing regulated by the ADA Standards) is whether he can actually
10 get to (and into) the bed, i.e., that there is at least 30 inches width on the
11 side of the bed so his wheelchair can get up next to the bed for transfer.
12 This is critical information because Plaintiff cannot walk and needs to
13 pull his wheelchair alongside the bed.
- 14 • For the desk where Plaintiff will eat and work, Plaintiff simply needs to
15 know that it has sufficient knee and toe clearance so that he can use it.
16 A simple statement like “the desk provides knee and toe clearance that
17 is at least 27 inches high, 30 inches wide, and runs at least 17 inches
18 deep” is more than sufficient. Because Plaintiff is confined to a
19 wheelchair, he needs to know this information to determine if the desk
20 is accessible to and useable by him.
- 21 • For the restroom toilet, Plaintiff only needs to know two things that
22 determine if he can transfer to and use the toilet; (1) that the toilet seat
23 height is between 17-19 inches (as required by the ADA Standards) and
24 (2) that it has the two required grab bars to facilitate transfer.
- 25 • For the restroom sink, the Plaintiff two things that will determine
26 whether he can use the sink from his wheelchair: (1) can he safely get his
27 knees under the toilet? To wit: does the sink provide the knee clearance
28 (27 inches high, 30 inches wide, 17 inches deep) and is any plumbing

1 under the sink wrapped with insulation to protect against burning
2 contact? The second thing is whether the lavatory mirror is mounted at
3 a lowered height so that wheelchair users can see it. A simple statement
4 like: “the lavatory sink provides knee clearance of at least 30 inches
5 wide, 27 inches tall and 17 inches deep, all of the under-sink plumbing
6 is wrapped, and the lowest reflective edge of the mirror is no more than
7 40 inches high” would suffice.

- 8 • Finally, for the shower, Plaintiff needs to know only a handful of things:
9 (1) what type of shower it is (transfer, standard roll-in, or alternate roll-
10 in), (2) whether it has an in-shower seat; (3) that there are grab bars
11 mounted on the walls; (4) that there is a detachable hand-held shower
12 wand for washing himself and (5) that the wall mounted accessories and
13 equipment are all within 48 inches height.

14 24. This small list of items are the bare necessities that Plaintiff must know
15 to make an independent assessment of whether the “accessible” hotel room
16 works for him. These things comprise the basics of what information is
17 reasonably necessary for Plaintiff (or any wheelchair user) to assess
18 independently whether a given hotel or guest room meets his or her
19 accessibility needs.

20 25. Other accessibility requirements such as slopes of surfaces, whether the
21 hand-held shower wand has a non-positive shut off valve, the temperature
22 regulator, the tensile strength and rotational design of grab bars, and so many
23 more minute and technical requirements under the ADA are beyond what is a
24 reasonable level of detail and Plaintiff does not expect or demand that such
25 information is provided.

26 26. But because the Defendants have failed to identify and describe the core
27 accessibility features in enough detail to reasonably permit individuals with
28 disabilities to assess independently whether a given hotel or guest room meets

1 his accessibility needs, the Defendants fail to comply with its ADA obligations
2 and the result is that the Plaintiff is unable to engage in an online booking of
3 the hotel room with any confidence or knowledge about whether the room will
4 actually work for him due to his disability.

5 27. This lack of information created difficulty for the Plaintiff and the idea
6 of trying to book this room -- essentially ignorant about its accessibility --
7 caused difficulty and discomfort for the Plaintiff and deterred him from
8 booking a room at the Hotel

9 28. Plaintiff travels frequently and extensively, not only for non-litigation
10 reasons but also because he is an ADA tester and actively engaged in finding
11 law breaking businesses and hauling them before the courts to be penalized
12 and forced to comply with the law.

13 29. As he has in the past, Plaintiff will continue to travel to the Roseville area
14 on a regular and ongoing basis and will patronize this Hotel once it has been
15 represented to him that the Defendant has changed its policies to comply with
16 the law and to determine if the Hotel is physically accessible as well as
17 complying with required reservation procedures. Plaintiff will, therefore, be
18 discriminated against again, i.e., be denied his lawfully entitled access, unless
19 and until the Defendant is forced to comply with the law.

20 30. Plaintiff has reason and motivation to use the Defendant's Hotel
21 reservation system and to stay at the Defendant's Hotel in the future. Among
22 his reasons and motivations are to assess these policies and facilities for
23 compliance with the ADA and to see his lawsuit through to successful
24 conclusion that will redound to the benefit of himself and all other similarly
25 situated. Thus, Plaintiff routinely revisits and uses the facilities and
26 accommodations of places he has sued to confirm compliance and to enjoy
27 standing to effectuate the relief promised by the ADA.
28

I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS

WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

31. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

32. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges advantages or accommodations to person with disabilities unless the entity can demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of those goods, services, facilities, privileges advantages or accommodations. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(B)(2)(A)(ii).

33. Specifically, with respect to reservations by places of lodging, a defendant must ensure that its reservation system, including reservations made by “any means,” including by third parties, shall:

- a. Ensure that individuals with disabilities can make reservations for accessible guest rooms during the same hours and in the same manner as individuals who do not need accessible rooms;
- b. Identify and describe accessible features in the hotels and guest rooms offered through its reservations service in enough detail to reasonably permit individuals with disabilities to assess independently whether a given hotel or guest room meets his or her accessibility needs; and
- c. Reserve, upon request, accessible guest rooms or specific types of guest rooms and ensure that the guest rooms requested are blocked and removed from all reservations

1 systems.

2 *See* 28 C.F.R. § 36.302(e).

3 34. Here, the defendant failed to modify its reservation policies and
4 procedures to ensure that it identified and described accessible features in the
5 hotels and guest rooms in enough detail to reasonably permit individuals with
6 disabilities to assess independently whether a given hotel or guest room meets
7 his or her accessibility needs and failed to ensure that individuals with
8 disabilities can make reservations for accessible guest rooms during the same
9 hours and in the same manner as individuals who do not need accessible
10 rooms.

11
12 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**
13 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.
14 Code § 51-53.)

15 35. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth
16 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this
17 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,
18 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,
19 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of
20 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.
21 Civ. Code §51(b).

22 36. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the
23 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

24 37. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the
25 Unruh Act by, inter alia, failing to comply with the ADA with respect to its
26 reservation policies and practices.

27 38. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty
28 and discomfort for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each responsible for

1 statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. *See* Civ. Code § 52(a).

2
3 **PRAYER:**

4 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide
5 relief as follows:

6 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the
7 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the
8 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not
9 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

10 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual
11 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

12 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit,
13 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code § 52(a).

14 4. “For equitable nominal damages for violation of civil rights. *See*
15 *Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski*, --- U.S. ---, 2021 WL 850106 (U.S. Mar. 8, 2021)
16 and any other equitable relief the Court finds appropriate.”
17
18
19

20 Dated: May 4, 2021

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

21
22
23 

24 By: _____

25 Russell Handy, Esq.

26 Attorneys for Plaintiff
27
28